

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—I beg to introduce :
The Bangalore University Bill, 1964.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home).—Sir, I beg to introduce.
“The Mysore Village Defence Parties Bill, 1964.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Village Defence Bill, 1964 is introduced.

BANGALORE UNIVERSITY BILL, 1964

(Motion to consider)

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Bangalore University Bill, 1964, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Bangalore University Bill, 1964 be taken into consideration.”

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I am very happy that the Bangalore University Bill is before this House for the consideration of the Hon'ble Members. The Committee appointed by the University Grants Commission remarked in its interim report that in the case of Bangalore no formal request had been received by the U.G.C. but the Committee observed that it would be one of the most suitable places in the country for the establishment of a University of a Federal type. Bangalore fulfils every condition mentioned in the interim report essential for such an University.

As such, the Government, after the receipt of the interim report, thought that a Committee called the Bangalore University Committee must be appointed and the report of the Committee is for the establishment of a Federal or a Unitary type of University at Bangalore. Sir, the Government appointed the Bangalore University Committee on 22nd August 1962 and by the end of August 1963 the Committee made a report. Before making the report, a sub-committee of the Bangalore University Committee visited places like Delhi, Bombay, etc. Through long discussions about the nature of the Federal University, they came all the more strengthened in the belief that Bangalore was a very fit place for starting a Federal University.

Sir, I only want to inform the House of the recommendations of the Bangalore University Committee. These are the recommendations:

“Government may take steps to establish a University in the next academic year i.e., 1964-65.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has a copy of it been made available ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Everybody has been given a copy long back, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Anyway, one copy may be placed on the Table of the House.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I will lay it on the Table, Sir. The Committee also recommends that the Central College may be handed over to the Bangalore University to serve as a nucleus for the establishment of the University for various post-graduate courses in research under the auspices of the University. They also recommend that the ultimate campus of the Bangalore University should be in Nagarbhavi Forest area. They also recommend that for the present the Government may locate the University and the administrative offices in the City itself. The last recommendation is the most important and that is, as a central University of Bangalore, it would be very helpful for bringing out emotional integration amongst the various components. The Committee urge the Government of Mysore to persuade the Union Government to take over the Bangalore University and run it as a Central University as early as possible.

Sir, it is clear that the proposed Bangalore University has been recommended to be a Federal University. In the whole of India there is only one Federal University and that is at Delhi. In foreign countries, especially in U. K., we have got the Federal University. One of the recent Federal Universities is at Durham.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is meant by the Federal University, Sir ? We want some clarification.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I will come to that point later on but I would like to quote something here and that is, the Committee are aware of the fact that the Bangalore University, as soon as it is established, could begin to function and discharge all its duties and responsibilities including the development of research and post-graduate development which is the most onerous responsibility of our Universities. They mean to say that with the establishment of the Bangalore University, it is possible that it could work as one of the best established Universities.

Sir, the Bangalore University is going to be national in character. It is thus clear that the Bangalore University is open to any student coming from any part of India and outside. The mobility has been one of the difficult problems of Universities. So far as the Bangalore University is concerned, it is proposed to make it as mobile as possible. Any student coming from any University where there are comparable studies can come over here and study. This is one of the important points and this important point is necessary because, after all, Bangalore City is a cosmopolitan city. Anybody who comes here must easily get admission. Even in our State between the Karnatak University and the Mysore University, mobility has become rather difficult—not impossible, but difficult. Yesterday I received a representation from one of the Hon'ble Members of this House to the effect that a student

had not been admitted in the Mysore University because the courses of study in the Karnataka University are not the same. But, in the Bangalore University there will be no such difficulty. I can assure the Hon'ble Member who has given me the representation that as soon as the Bangalore University is established, there will be no such difficulty. They have also stated what should be the aim of the university. The university should concentrate on science and technology along with humanistic studies, having in view the relative needs of the country in the present context of its development. The university must be open to all students coming from different parts of India and outside. They have further resolved that emphasis should be laid on the cultural unity of India as a whole and the cultural background should be imparted in the university.

When the Bangalore University is formed there will be 27 colleges forming constituent parts of that university. All the colleges that come under this will not be considered as affiliated colleges but they will be constituent part of the university. A constituent college is a part of the university. A college means university and university means college. That means, any course of educational studies is not imposed by a body called university but they are prescribed by them alone. Take for instance the Board of Studies. As a creature of the university the affiliated colleges will have no voice in it. But in a federal university the Board of Studies is representative not only of the university but also of the constituent colleges. Whatever is prescribed by the Board of Studies is prescribed by the entire body and not by any one of the bodies. So, the first and foremost body in the university is.....

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—May I know what is the strength of the university?

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—It is expected to be between 20,000 to 25,000. It will take away from the Mysore University half the strength. The Mysore University will be left with about 25,000 student population.

The Committee has observed:

“In a federal type of university, the university undertakes the entire responsibility of maintaining the post-graduate laboratories for the benefit of students in all the constituent colleges. This is one of the main features of the federal type and thus would avoid duplication of such expensive laboratories in the several constituent colleges.

In a federal university, apart from the direct appointments to the university teaching staff, the teaching staff in the constituent colleges will have to be recognised by the university and the appointment committee will recommend the teacher for such recognition. Only the recognised teachers can teach in the constituent colleges.

The great advantages in a federal university is that post-graduate work in any subject would form a single unit of students in any branch or subject even though the students

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

may have registered as students in different constituent colleges so that they undergo a unified and identical course. The university maintains the laboratory in science subjects, where students from all colleges could go and work.

Sir, in an affiliated university what happens is that, there will be two or three colleges where post-graduate study facilities are available. Take, for example physics. There will be three or four colleges having some sort of laboratory equipment, with the result that there would be overlapping. But in a federal university what happens is, that one can join any college for post-graduate studies and he will take instruction from the university and not from the college. The lecturing, practicals, experiments, etc., will all be done at one central place and there will be no duplication. There will be uniformity of standard. This is the most important thing. Besides this, the staff of the college may be required to take part in the teaching of post-graduate studies.

The appointment of teachers is another important thing. In the federal university appointments are made not by the colleges but by an Appointment Board consisting of college authorities as also the university authorities who sit together and make appointments. The teaching staff is the staff of the university and they are recognised by the university. Nobody who is not teaching in university of this type can be recognised as teacher of a university. That means there will be uniform standard and a high standard of recruitment. With the high standard of recruitment the standard of education is expected to increase.

Sir, there are two types of appointments; one is the appointment of staff to the university course, and another post-graduate course and research course. Wherever there are post-graduate courses and research courses, they are under the control of the university. In the affiliated university for instance, if a college is given recognition for post-graduate courses, the responsibility of teaching is entirely that of the Government and not of the university. The university only examines and there is nothing more. Here, since a college is given permission to have post-graduate course, the entire thing goes to the university and the university will be responsible. That is a most important thing. Once the research and post-graduate studies in a college goes to the university, naturally the under-graduate studies in those colleges go to them. For instance even for under-graduate studies no teacher who is not recognised by the university can teach. Recognised by the university means; they are to be taken into service after the recommendation of the Appointment Committee on which the representatives of the university serve. There will be a sort of control throughout in order to improve quality. Everybody has a part to play in the federal set-up. It is not a question of a few principals being members of the Senate; but here the whole body of principals being members of the Senate.

There also, those who are interested in education are members of the Senate like graduates, may be commerce graduates or law graduates or medical graduates or engineering graduates. Not merely that. We have gone further.

1-30 P.M.

I will give the main features of a Federal University.

In a Federal University, there would be no University without the colleges and all the colleges together would almost constitute the university. The entire educational policy would be set by the colleges and the university together. Both the colleges and university set the pattern of education.

In a federal type of university, the university undertakes the entire responsibility of maintaining the post-graduate laboratories for the benefit of students in all the constituent colleges. This is one of the main features of the federal type and this would avoid duplication of such expensive laboratories in the several constituent colleges.

In a federal university, apart from the direct appointments to the university teaching staff, the teaching staff in the constituent colleges will have to be recognised by the university, and the appointment committee will recommend the teacher for such recognition. Only the recognised teacher can teach in the constituent colleges.

The great advantage in a federal university is that post-graduate work in any subject would form a single unit of students in any branch or subject even though the students may have registered as students in different constituent colleges so that they undergo a unified and identical course. The university maintains the laboratory in science subjects where students from all colleges could go and work.

In a Federal University, constituent colleges form an integral part of the university to which they belong. Each college may be an independent body but collectively they provide to the students and almost all the staff of the university. The university would have additional staff consisting of the professors and readers and a few lecturers for pursuing the research programme in the university. But for those few members of the staff of the university almost the entire work of the post-graduate courses would be shared by the members of the staff of the college themselves.

Another important feature in a federal type of university is that the academic bodies like the Boards of Studies are a collective matter, as the teaching programme of the university, is a collective affair, as all the concerned teachers are appointed by the university and also paid partly or fully by the university. It is thus not possible to impose any courses of studies on the constituent colleges. The staff members of the colleges must necessarily be the members of the Boards of Studies. And then the visitorial powers of the Government are there and these are very rarely used.

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

I will now draw your attention to another side. There is a lot of similarity between the Delhi University and our University, i.e., the Bangalore University, that is going to come. But there is some difference and that is, the Delhi University makes distinction between the constituent colleges and the affiliated colleges. But in the Bangalore University, we have only one set of colleges and they are all constituent colleges. There are no affiliated colleges as they have in the Delhi University. We have thought about the problem very carefully and come to the conclusion that in a developing city like Bangalore, it is not possible to have two types of colleges, one constituent and the other affiliated. We have thought of the colleges, the constituent colleges. They must be separate and independent units, giving part of their independence for the collective benefit of the entire University. I have also seen the composition of the senate and the syndicate and academic council of the Delhi University. We could not have the entire thing. We have made our own changes.

Some people were talking with me just now that the Senate has a big body. But for a Federal University, it cannot be helped. We have 27 colleges. Naturally you cannot help it, but make it big. The graduates there would be different types of graduates. All graduates must be made part and parcel of the University and you have to give them more representation.

We have one advantage in the University. And that is, there will be as little of election as possible. The election arrangement has been eliminated to the extent possible. But, in a few cases we could not help. In the representation of graduates, it could not be done except by election. There only, we have agreed to the election arrangement. Otherwise, we have tried to eliminate elections altogether.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Does it mean graduates throughout the State or graduates of only Bangalore area?

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Only Bangalore area. The second point is, that as all the Hon'ble Members know, we have scrupulously avoided any interference by the Government. In the entire Bill, Hon'ble Members will find that the Government does not appear at all.

SRI G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—It does appear.

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—It does appear in the garb of the Chancellor. There, you cannot help it.

SRI V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—It is practically a Government body.

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Now the Hon'ble Members feel that the Government enters into the picture through the Chancellor. Since the Governor is the Chancellor, naturally, Government will have some voice. But we have made it purposely so, because it is the pattern in Delhi. There also, in the case of the Chancellor, the powers are such that he will not always interfere with the University. The second point is about the Chancellor.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—In the Venkateshwara University, the Chief Justice is the Chancellor.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—But we have taken the Delhi model. There they call him the Visitor. We do not call him Visitor here. He is the Vice-Chancellor here.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Pro-chancellor.....

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sri Venkate Gowda knows that a Pro-Chancellor is somebody who has no powers. When he attends the University, he will have some responsibility rather than any power at all. The Pro-Chancellor, if he happens to be the Education Minister, will be divided between the University and the Government. When the University takes a decision, the Pro-Chancellor as Education Minister, has to take a decision at the Governmental level. There, there will be some conflict. After due consideration, we have given up the Pro-Chancellor. In the Delhi University, they have the Pro-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

The Syndicate is a large body. There will be 75 or 80 members in the entire body of the senate. But there it is more. But we do not want to have such a large number. We wanted that representation first and foremost should be given to the constituent colleges. That is why we have been very careful in not making it so big nor are we interested in making it as small as possible because smallness would mean some body else, and not all the colleges. Then with regard to the election of Vice-Chancellor, we have adopted here the model of the Delhi University. When the Sub-Committee went to Delhi, they had a long talk with the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, U. G. C. Chairman and other important persons. By adopting that model we can avoid direct election. In the Karnatak University, there is a sort of direct election. Of course the Karnatak University has been rather fortunate. But nobody can be always fortunate. There are bound to be troubles here and there. So, we could not have them the model of Karnatak University. Nor were we in favour of nomination of Vice-Chancellor by the Government because, members of this House and also of the Upper House have said that Government has been nominating persons and that they ought to have nominated this man or that man. Here we do not want to enter into a fray. It is for the University Syndicate to appoint two members who are unconnected with the University and the Chancellor will nominate one person. These three persons will sit together and they will recommend a panel of not less than three names. The Chairman has no special powers and there will be no occasion for the Chairman to use his extra powers because the Committee consists of three persons. It has worked very well. I do not know what is working in the mind of my hon'ble friend. Elected element cannot work and nomination also cannot work. Then the alternative is that of Delhi Model. In Delhi it has worked well and I do hope in a cosmopolitan City like Bangalore, it will work very well. I have no hesitation in my mind that the Committee after visiting Delhi and after meeting responsible distinguished people in Delhi had come to the conclusion that we must

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

adopt the Delhi model. I do not want to say anything more because this University is thinking of introducing new studies.

Sri. C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—There is a provision for donor members who pay not less than Rs. 50,000. Then politics will get in.

Sri-S. R. KANTHI.—No politics will get in. The committee has recommended the introduction of Geophysics, Nuclear Physics, Biophysics, Communication Engineering, Aeronautics, Astrophysics, Industrial Chemistry, Mining and Metallurgy, Meteorology, Fine Arts, Oriental Learning, Law, Public Administration, Business Administration and Industrial Management, etc., in the new University.

The Committee is of the view that these additional subjects should be started when the finances are adequately forthcoming. So, Sir, in Bangalore City, there are a number of Universities and also very important commercial firms. There is also one University called the Tata University. All these universities will have to co-operate among themselves as also the industries. For instance, Sir, when the Sub-Committee visited Bombay, they visited the research Centre of the Bombay University where they had recently discovered something in the dye-stuff by which the industry today has been benefitted by not less than Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 crores. The most important thing in a University is research. In Bangalore City, there are a large number of industries spread over and it is possible that we can co-operate with them and then establish research centres whereby in course of time we may be able to invent something which will go a long way in our progress towards socialist society. In India, the post-graduates are far less. Of late, most of our brilliant students are going to technical and professional colleges, and those who have been rejected by the technical and professional colleges go to the Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges, with the result there today we find there are very few research scholars in our country. The Committee has recommended that there should be two courses, one called the Honours Course and the other the ordinary course. Such a course was there in the Mysore University formerly. Of late, it has been given up. We have watched during the last few years what has been the effect of that. This has come in the way of the prosecution of studies in respect of pure science and pure humanities. The country cannot progress without research scholars and researches. In England, a professor or a reader of a University is not required to take more than 32-hours in a year. He is expected to do mostly research. In India, we have not as yet reached that stage. Our doctorates are hardly 60 to 65 per year in the entire country. In the United Kingdom, the doctors are far more than what we are producing per year in our universities in the entire country. In view of the agricultural and industrial importance of our country, we should encourage more and more research scholars and post-graduate studies. In Bangalore City, we have got post-graduate studies almost in everything, in Law, Commerce, Engineering, Medical, Science, and so on.

That is why we can do it far better in this beautiful City of Bangalore. There are people who believe that what is wanted is not a university but education at the primary and secondary levels. Both the schools of thought are correct. We want higher education because good higher education means good teachers and good tuition. In foreign countries, even in primary schools you find B.As. and M.As. teaching, but in our country we cannot afford to have even Matriculate-trained as school teachers in an adequate number. Yesterday, the Advisor to the Government of India, who was with us for some time was telling that two things were essential in a developing country. One is strengthening of education in Middle School and the second is strengthening of higher education, especially post-graduate research. If we do that, we can get good teachers and the standard of education will go up. It is said by the foreigners that what we teach in our secondary schools as Science is 70 years old and that the Mathematics we are teaching in high schools is 50 years old. We must very seriously think how this is happening. We have not been able to turn out enough number of post-graduate students who will spread out in the country as teachers and torch-bearers. This University which we are proposing to have in Bangalore City has all the possibilities of quick development. It is also possible that at our request the Government of India may take it over as a Central University. The Bangalore University Committee has recommended that and after this Bill is passed here, a resolution to that effect will be introduced. Nobody can give an assurance in this behalf because it is the Parliament which has to pass the law and after the Bill is passed into law the Government of India can think of taking it over. We have to march ahead. It is true that education is both an investment and a social service. It is not merely that but something more than that; it is just like the flow of the Ganga which you cannot stop. That is why we are here today to discuss the establishment of the Bangalore University. I have no doubt that are the Hon'ble Members, will support it. With these words I commend the Bill for the consideration of the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ: ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ದೀರ್ಘವಾದ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಅದರ ಒಂದು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮ ಪರಿಚಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನವರು ಮೂರನೇ ಪೆಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ್ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊಸ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವರದಿ ಯನ್ನೊಪ್ಪಿಸಲು ರಚಿಸಿರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ ಆ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಷಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಈ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದ ಕಮಿಷಿಯು ಏನೊಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೊಪ್ಪಿಸಿತೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ವರದಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನಿಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಆಮೋಘವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪಡೆದ ಅನಂತರ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ರೋಪ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದೇನೋ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಚಾರವೇ. ಇದೊಂದು ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವಾಗಿ ಶ್ಲಾಘಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ)

ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆವೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸರಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಆ ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರೇಜುಗಳು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮರ್ಪಕ ವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಇವು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರೇಜುಗಳ ಮಟ್ಟ ಇನ್ನಿತರ ಕಾರೇಜುಗಳ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಳಗಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರಿ ಕಾರೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಲ್ಲ, ರಾಜೀ ರೇಟರಿ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎಕ್ಸಿಪೆಂಟೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ಟೆಪೆಂಡ್ ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲೇ ಬಹಳ ಅವಹೇಳನಕಾರವಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇನ್ನಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಇಂಥ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈಗ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕೆಲಸ ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಶೆಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇದೊಂದು ಸಾಹಸದ ಕೆಲಸ.

2-00 P.M.

ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಗಿರಲಿ ಅದು ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರೇಜುಗಳ ದುಃಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥವರಾ ಇವತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಮಾಡತೀರಲು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳೆಂಬುದು ಬಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ನಿಜಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹವಾಮಾನ, ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್, ಸೈನ್ಸ್, ಇವಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬ ತುಳುಕಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಮಾದರಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥವರಾ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾಗುವುದೇನೋ ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆಲ್ಲಿ ಲವೇಲೆತವೂ ಅನುಮಾನ ಎಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ರೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಬಂಡಿತ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ರೂಪಿತವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಜಾಗೃತವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆತುರಾತುರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಆತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಇನ್ನೂ 3-4 ವಾರಗಳ ಕಾಲ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೊಳಗೆಯೇ ಒಂದು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಯಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಚಿವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವು ಮುಗಿಯುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಪುನಃ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಂಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 32, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66 ಮತ್ತು 71—ಇವು "shall come into force at once" ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ

ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೂಬೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಲಂಗಳು ಒಂದೇ ಸಾರಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಹತ್ತಾರು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದು, ಇನ್ನು ಉಳಿದವು ಯಾವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಗೆಜಟ್ ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೋ ಈಗ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವವು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 'ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಫೆಡರೇ' ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಮನೂಬೆ ಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಫಲರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮನೂಬೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೂಬೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಾರಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೊಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಅಂತಹ ಮನೂಬೆಗಳಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಫಲದಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಿ, ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವೇ ಇವರು ಈ ಮನೂಬೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಯನ್ನು, ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಫೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್, ಅಕಾಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇವರು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ಫಲಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಯಾದೀತೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಫೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಂಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯ ಕಾರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಪಹಾಸ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈಡಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಅವನ್ನು ಬಂಧಿತವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸು ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು 62, 63 ಮತ್ತು 64ನೆಯ ಕಲಂಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಯಾರು, ಅವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರು, ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಮೂದಿಸಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. 'ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 64ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ "to recommend to the Chancellor to make arrangements for constituting the Senate, the Syndicate, the Academic Council and other authorities of the university." ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾಗತಕ್ಕ ರೀಡರ್ಸ್, ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ಸ್, ಲೆಕ್ಟರರ್ಸ್, ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ಸ್, ಬರ್ಸರ್ಸ್ ಇವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು 3 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಜ್ಞಾನದ ಹೊಳೆ ಹರಿಯಬೇಕು. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಇತ್ತರ್ಥವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರುಗಳ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಣೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಶ್ರೇಯಸ್ಸು ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಂತಿದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಗಗಳು ಎರಡು. ಒಂದನೆಯದು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರ ಪಂಗಡ, ಎರಡನೆಯದು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಪಂಗಡ, ಇವೆರಡು ಪಂಗಡಗಳು ಸಾಮರಸ್ಯದಿಂದ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತ ರಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಫೆಡರೇ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರಾಫುನೀಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸ. ಆ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರ ಮಟ್ಟ ಹೆಚ್ಚಬೇಕು. ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಇಂದಿನ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮಟ್ಟ ನಿಂತಿದೆ. ಈ ಆಕ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್‌ನವರು ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಎರಡುಮೂರು ಮೆಟ್ಟಲುಗಳನ್ನು ದಾಟಿ ಅಮೇಲೆ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರುಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಫೋನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿ ತಮಗೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇಮಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಫೆಡರೇ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ತಿರುಪ್ಪ)

ವನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ದ್ವಾರೋ ಅದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ತಪ್ಪು, ಈ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ 15 ಜನಗಳಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷನಿಗೆ ಕಮಿಷಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟಿಗೆ ಏನು ಪವರ್ ಇವೆಯೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಸರವಾಗಿ ವೈಸ್-ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಇವರು ಇಷ್ಟ ಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವೈಸ್-ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವೊಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಂಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕೆಟ್ಟ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳು ಗುರುತರವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿವೆ. ಕೆಲವಾರು ಗುಂಪುಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಕಲ್ಪನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳು ಕೆಲವು ಆಗಿವೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಾರದಂತೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಶಯ/ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಂದರೂ ಬರಬಾರದು. ಸಂಶಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಚಿವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಆಪಾದನೆಗೂ ಒಳಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಪಾಪದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ ಪುಣ್ಯದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನೋ ಗುರ್ ಗುರ್ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಕಂಠಿಯವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಏನೇನೋ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಇದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾಗಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಂದು ಒಳಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ಉಪಾಪೋಕ್ಷ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗದಂತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ಲಾಸುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ (3) ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ (9) ರಲ್ಲಿ officers of the university ಯಲ್ಲಿ "Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, Bursar, Deans of Faculties, and such other persons in the service of the university as may be declared by the statutes to be the officers of the university." ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕೊಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದಂಥ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಒಬ್ಬರು ಸರಿಯಾದಂಥ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ನೇತೃತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು 10ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಡಿಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನು ಎರಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಗರ್ನರ್ ಅವರೇ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮಗೆ ಏನು ಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಭಾವನೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್

ಅಗತ್ಯ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸದೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಧಾನ್ಯಲರ ಅನ್ವೇಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಭಾವಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳಗಾಗದೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಯಂ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಧಾನ್ಯಲರ ಅನ್ನು ಸೆನೆಟ್‌ನವರು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 'The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor from out of a panel of not less than three persons selected by a committee constituted under sub-section (3) ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಳ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ವೈಸ್-ಚಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮಾದರಿ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳ ನೇಮಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಮೂವರನ್ನು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಆರಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ 12 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಯಾವ ಗಲಾಟೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ದಕ್ಷರಾದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು 12 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮನುಷ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರು ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕವರ್ಗದವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಐ.ಎ.ಸಿ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇದೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಭವ ಇರತಕ್ಕವರನ್ನೇ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಗೂ ಇವರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ನಿಕಟವಾದ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಬೆಳೆದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡದೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಇದೂ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ದಿವಾಳಿಮೆಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕ ಸಾಹಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕ ವರ್ಗದವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಾಪವಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಒಬ್ಬ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಅವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಆಳತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನ್ನಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕ ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲರತ್ತವರನ್ನು ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಕಾನ್ಸಿಟಿಯುಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ Senate, nominated, Ex-officio Members and Elected Members ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಿಂದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೂ ಸ್ನೇಟರ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ನಿಂದ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೂ ಚುನಾಯಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸಾಲದು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈಗ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಸೆನೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ 8 ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—“Three members of Parliament—two to be elected by the Lok Sabha from among its own members in such manner as the Speaker may direct and one to be elected from the Rajya Sabha from among its own members in such manner as the Chairman may direct.” ಎಂದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವು ಅವರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಸೆನೆಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ರೇಬರ್ ರೆಸ್ಟ್ರಿಂಟೆಡ್ ಅನ್ನು ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು.

ಡೋನರ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮರಾಠೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ನಿಂಡಿಕೇಟಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮತ್ತು ಚರಾಯಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇರಬಾರದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮತ ಚರಾಯಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು 30 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಹುದ್ದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ನಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಅಕಾಡಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಕಾಡಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವಿರಬೇಕು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ರನ್ಯಾದರೂ ಚುನಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ನೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ಟಾಡ್ಯೂಟ್ಸ್, ಆರ್ಟಿನೆನ್ಸ್, ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಅವರು ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೇ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಮೊದಲು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಸ್ಟಾಡ್ಯೂಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರಬಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ.—ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎನು ಸ್ಟಾಡ್ಯೂಟ್ಸ್ ಇವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೇ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಫೆದರಲ್ ವಾದದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಾದವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಥಮ ರಿಡೆಕ್ಟಾರ್, ಪ್ರಥಮ ಬರ್ಸಾರ್ ಇಂಥವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬಹಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ ಇದೆ. ನಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಏನು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಯವರೇ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯಕಾರಿ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಂಡಿಕೇಟಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಚರಾಯಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಕಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಪ್ಪರೊಳಗೆ ನಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ರಚನೆ ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಆದೇಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕಮಾಡಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನೂ ಪಡೆದು ಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಒಂದು ಅಂಗವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬರಬಹುದು. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶಿತವಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಅದರ ಅಂಗರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ

ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬೋಧನೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯವಾದ ಸಲಹೆ. ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡೀ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೇ ಹೊಸ ಕಳೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು ಹಳೆಯ ಕಂದಾಚಾರದ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೇ ಬೋಧನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬೋಧನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ಎಲ್ಲೆಯೇ ಇರಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ತಂದು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕವರ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಕಡೆಗಾಣೆನದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರಾತಿ ಸಿದ್ಧವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಹೊಸ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಬರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ನೀರು ಹಳೆಯ ನೀರನ್ನು ಒತ್ತರಿಸಿತು ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ ಹೊಸಬರನ್ನು ತರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯಿಂದ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕವರ್ಗದವರು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ದೆಹಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಂತಿ ನಿಲೇತನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಶ್ವಭಾರತಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಮಾದರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ನೇತೃತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗ್ರಹ ಪೂರ್ವಕ ವಾಗಿ ಬಿಸ್ತು ಹ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾಗಲಿರುವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ರೀತಿಯ ಸಹಕಾರವನ್ನೂ ನೆರವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಥೈನಾನ್‌ಷಿಯರ್ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಂನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಖರ್ಚಿಗಾಗಿ 7 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು 7 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಂದ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ 27 ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಯೆಂಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ತಾವು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೆನಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅದರಂತೆ ಆ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳು ಇರುವಂತೆ ಸಹ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಸರಕಾರದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರೋಸ್ಟೆಗ್ರಾಜುಯೇಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಸ್‌ಸ್ ಇರುವ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಪ್ರೋಸ್ಟೆಗ್ರಾಜುಯೇಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಬಹುದು, ಸೆಂಟ್ ಜೋಸೆಫ್ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಬಹುದು, ಮುಂಚ್ ಕಾರ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಬಹುದು, ಸ್ಪರ್ಥೆ ಬಾರದೇಯಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರನ್ನೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ; ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಪ್ರೊಫೆ ಸರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ರೀಡರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣದ ನೆರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹಣದ ನೆರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಶಂಕೆಯುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾ ನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಹಣ ಸಾಲುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; 7 ಲಕ್ಷವು 70 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಐಷು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಂತೋಷ, ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಶಂಕೆಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ, ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಮನೋದಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

2-30 P.M.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir I am sorry I am not able to accede to the Minister's fond hope that everyone of this House would welcome the Bill. Sir, in the very recommendations of the U.G.C. they have observed that the Bangalore would be one of the most suitable place for the establishment of University of a federal type. I do not know what the U.G.C. has told the Government and the financial assistance that we get for the purpose of starting this University. The U.G.C. should have taken steps to establish such a University at their own cost. Sir, the Bangalore University Committee has submitted a report and it would have been proper for the Government to have allowed that report to be discussed in this House first, and ascertain the opinion of the Hon'ble members before taking a decision to start a University in Bangalore. In my humble opinion, the decision is hasty, it is premature and uncalled for. It will also mean a strenuous effect on the finances of the State; that aspect has not been taken into consideration. As you are aware, we are passing through critical times and we know the financial position of our State. Though Mysore is known to have so much of natural resources, we are not able to exploit them to the extent possible for want of finances. We are not able to spend money for developing rural economy, and to provide drinking water facilities in rural parts. The Hon'ble Minister knows that he is not able to provide Rs. 20,000 for the construction of a school building. According to the Directive Principle, it is the State's responsibility to give compulsory education. Though we have it all over the State, yet it could not be implemented successfully for want of trained teachers, financial difficulty and so on. Such being the case, is it correct to have taken the initiative to start a University as proposed in the Bill? Sir, so many minor projects have been investigated and they are ready according to the Deputy Minister but they could not be taken up for want of finances. I am aware of a statement made by the Finance Minister that he would not be able to pay the officials—that is the financial position of the State. I request the Hon'ble Minister to reconsider the entire matter and defer this Bill for the time being.

The Minister said that this University would be federal in character and all that. When I went through the provisions of the Bill and the Karnatak University Act and the Mysore University Act, I do not find any difference in the provisions. The only thing is that the University would be confined to the Bangalore Urban district and will not have any college affiliated. The Karnataka University has got 26 purposes while this Bill provides for 20. I do not find the basic difference between this proposed University and the existing Universities in the State.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, you will find the same thing when you read the Delhi University Act. It is not in the wording but in the action that the University differs. I have already said that post-graduate and research work is the sole responsibility of the University and that the

different colleges will not be allowed to have their own teachers unless they are screened and approved by the committee and the Syndicate. That means, the teachers will be fully under the control of this University. All these are the main factors.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It may be to constitute better management and employ better teachers. But, could it not be done in the existing Universities?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The main idea of a Federal University is compactness. In any other place, you cannot have a Federal University, because they are dispersed over a large area. In the City, you can have such a University because you can have the staff appointed. So it is possible only here. In the Mysore University, if you start post-graduate study in the Mangalore College, you cannot exercise control.....

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If it is the idea of compactness, that could have been done, by bifurcating the Mysore University...

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Cambridge and Oxford Universities are all compact.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Should it not be possible to make the Mysore University as compact as possible and take away from its jurisdiction the other Colleges and attach it to the University of Karnataka? It could be done. The Mysore University could have been made Federal in nature and the other Colleges could have been attached to the Karnatak University. That could have been done by amending the Karnatak and Mysore University Acts.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—What he means to say is that instead of the proposed Bangalore Federal University, he wants to have a Mysore Federal University. It is always possible to have as many Federal Universities as possible.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That question ought to have been, in my opinion, considered. My only objection to the establishment of this University is that we have not yet been able to procure necessary funds required to carry the activities of such a University. We know how the Universities are functioning. Unless the Government comes to this it rescue by way of giving financial aid, it will be very difficult for the Universities to function. Unless we are sure that we will be able to meet the necessary financial assistance, it may not be possible to see that it functions successfully. Unless it functions successfully, where is the justness or need for establishing such Universities which ultimately do not prove themselves successful? That is my only objection. That could not be a just measure at this juncture when we are passing through critical days.

In respect of powers and other things of this University, as I have observed already, more or less they are akin to the provisions that are found in the Karnatak University Act. Here, the establishment and maintenance of a Hostel is also found in some of the clauses. But, what is a Hostel, has not been defined in the definition clause. In the

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

Karnatak, Mysore, Madras and Andhra University Acts, that word 'hostel' is defined. Unless that is done, Hostel beyond the University area is likely to be recognised. Therefore, it is desirable to define the word 'hostel' in the definition clause. That is more important. It must be a hostel situated within the Bangalore Urban District to which this Act applies. The Hon'ble Minister gave the reason as to why the Pro-Chancellor has not been given a place in the University. So far as the powers of the University are concerned under clause 4, I wish to invite your attention to item 20, which says:

"to admit educational institutions not maintained by the University to the privileges of the University as Constituent Colleges or to withdraw such privileges;"

It would have been better even to define what a Constituent College is. We find that definition in other University Acts. Should it not be within the University area? University area has been defined as under:

"'University area' means the area of the Bangalore District (Urban) and includes such other area contiguous to such area as the Government may from time to time by notification in the Official Gazette specify."

So, this Constituent College means any College that could be admitted to the privileges of the University and should have been situated within the Bangalore Urban District, and unless that is made clear, it is likely that the University could admit educational institutions situated even outside the limits of Bangalore Urban District. Item (xxi) says:

"to make grants from the funds of the University,

- (a) for extra-mural teaching,
- (b) for physical and military training,
- (c) for students' unions,....."

Should it be within the University or not we do not know. Should it be for the Bangalore University or not, is not clear. There is a vagueness in the phraseology. Is it confined to the University or not, we do not know. Suppose there is a military training school in Mangalore. From Mangalore I can claim that we have given a good physical and military training. Why should not the University of Bangalore make some grants? As for 'Students' Unions', should it mean within the University area or University Colleges or Constituent Colleges, we do not know. There is vagueness with regard to sports and athletic clubs also. We do not know whether the Colleges would come within the area or not. All these things have got to be made specific, because no other institution or association or sports club could be entitled to seek any grant as the basic object is the compactness of the University area that it should confine itself only to a District limit. Item (e) of the clause says:

"for the maintenance, of institutions or associations devoted to educational purposes."

This is the only item that would do more harm and mischief for the maintenance of institutions or associations devoted to educational purposes. Any body can claim that he is running a new institution or association and that he needs some assistance. So, it should be done out of the University funds. Which institution the Hon'ble Minister or the draftsman would mean, I do not know and this particular item has not been found either in the Karnatak University Act or Mysore or Madras or Andhra Act. This is a new item that has been incorporated in item (e). It depends upon the whims and fancies of the University authorities.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Clause 49½ says :

“Colleges within the University Area may be admitted to such privileges of the University as Constituent Colleges as the Chancellor may decide on satisfying the conditions specified in this Section.”

So, the University area is defined. It is in respect of all the Colleges which come within the University area. How can the University give money to an outside body? The Hon'ble Member may also read clause 5.

“Save as otherwise provided in this Act, the powers of the University conferred by or under this Act, shall be exercised in the University area and no educational institution beyond the said area shall be associated or admitted to any privileges of the University.”

The powers of the University conferred by this Act or under this Act shall be exercised within the University area. It is quite clear.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—What is the harm in specifically mentioning that such grants should be given only within the University area?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—This is covered by clause 5 and clause 49. So any power being used by the University will have to conform itself to clauses 5 and 49.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—So far as item (xxi) is concerned, when you make grants to the funds of the Colleges, which are those Colleges; are they University Colleges? “for the maintenance of institutions or associations devoted to educational purposes”. Which are those bodies which would maintain institutions or associations? Should it be a part of the University, or even outside institutions and associations that lie within the jurisdiction can claim grants? It is not specific. I request the Minister to see that item (e) is deleted.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—After all, the University functions are the same everywhere. These powers have been taken not only from the Delhi University Act but also from the Mysore University and the Karnatak University Acts. The wordings are the same. There has been no difficulty all the while.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Item (e) has got to be deleted inasmuch as it is not found anywhere in the existing University Acts, either in the Karnatak University Act or in the Mysore University Act.

Proviso to clause 6 reads:

“Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent religious instruction being given in the manner prescribed by the Ordinances to those who have consented to receive it.”

I question the wisdom of incorporating this proviso. When we are in the secular State, why should the University offer to give instructions in a particular religion if the students have consented to receive it? This proviso has not been found anywhere in other University Acts. This has been purposely put in. I do not know how it would be proper for a University to do such a thing. It would, if I may say so, contravene the provisions of the Constitution inasmuch as it creates discrimination and also unnecessary complications. I request the Minister to see that this particular thing is deleted.

Coming to the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, the Minister would say that this is a thing taken from the Delhi University Act. The best thing would be, since the Senate is the supreme governing body of the University, it should have its say in the matter of appointing the Vice-Chancellor. It would be desirable that the Senate should send a panel of three names to the Chancellor and the Chancellor should choose one out of the three. Here what is sought to be done is, that the Syndicate should appoint two persons not connected with the University and the Chancellor should nominate one man. The three would constitute themselves into a committee. Then the Committee has got to send a panel of three names and the Chancellor has to pick up one. If the Chancellor does not approve the list, he should send back for fresh recommendations. In the Madras University, the Senate has got to send a panel of three names and the Chancellor has to pick up one out of them. In the Karnatak University, the Syndicate has to recommend a list of names to the Senate and the Senate would pick up two names and the Chancellor would pick up one out of them.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Should we leave it to the University bodies to make a direct selection? Much of the trouble has been on account of direct election. People are likely to be divided between themselves. Some bitterness will ensue. That is why in Delhi they have introduced this method of the Senate having two members being nominated by them and one nominated by the Chancellor and the three would constitute themselves into a Committee who would send a panel of names. There has been no grouse, no rivalry, no bitterness. They strongly recommend this proposal to us. Since we are thinking that the Central Government must take over this University as a Central University, it is better that we have this system. In any case, if we have any other thing, they

will not agree to it, because they have tried it in Delhi and it is going on very well.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Minister must remember that Bangalore is not Delhi. He says that the Members of the senate would be divided. If they are asked to nominate two persons, would they not be divided?

3-00 P.M.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—These two persons are to be unconnected with the University. There is no likelihood of any trouble.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I maintain that because they are unconnected with the University, they might not know anything about University affairs. They might be agriculturists working in the fields or labourers working in factories. Is it possible for such people to give a good Vice-Chancellor? It is the syndicate that is the supreme body. Should the syndicate have no voice in the selection? The procedure suggested in the Bill might have successfully worked in Delhi but it might not work here at all. This is the most objectionable part of the Bill and I hope the Hon'ble Minister for Education would consider its amendment. The clause states that if the Chancellor does not like the names, he may send them back and fresh recommendations are to be made. I feel that the University syndicate must have a voice and finally let the Chancellor select the persons recommended by the senate.

Clause 12 (5) contravenes the basic idea of the jurisdiction and power of the syndicate. In case of an emergency, the Vice-Chancellor might exercise the powers of the bodies of the University and submit the matter to the syndicate. If they do not approve of his action, then it becomes nullified. But why should the Vice-Chancellor refer the matter to the Chancellor for his decision?

In respect of the appointment of the Dean, in the absence of a Professor or Reader, the Vice-Chancellor can designate a teacher as Dean. But he might select a junior man. The clause must state that such a person should be the seniormost man.

To the Senate the Mayor of the Corporation of Bangalore is admitted as Member. I do not know if the Mayor of Delhi is a member of the Senate at Delhi. Then the President of the Kannada Sahitya Parishad and the President of the Chamber of Commerce automatically become members. There are several bodies in Bangalore like the Rotary Club, the Lions Club and recently they have started a Donkeys' Club. Should all of them be given representation on the Senate? Where is the end to this? Tomorrow, the Tamil Sahitya Parishad may claim representation because Bangalore is a cosmopolitan city having so many Sahitya Parishads. Why not consider the case of the Telugu or the Urdu or the English Sahitya Parishads?

In clause 17, Government has the power to nominate two Head Masters to the Senate. I think this nomination might be best left to the Chancellor. Government should not take the responsibility.

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

For a meeting of the Senate, the approval of the Chancellor has to be obtained. I do not see the relevancy of this provision. We do not find similar provisions in other University Acts.

Under clause 21, the syndicate might recognise hostels not administered by the University and suspend or withdraw recognition. It is not clear whether such a hostel should be situated within the limits of the University area. Under clause 5 only when a college applies to be admitted to the privileges of the University, it would get those privileges. Here also it must be clarified whether the hostel is administered or recognised by the University. Also conditions for grants are to be specified. Otherwise the clause would be misused. I do not know if the clause has been introduced just to favour this or that institution. We find such abuses taking place now. This is a mischievous clause and must go.

The other provisions of the Bill are mere replica of the Karnatak University Act. There is nothing in them that adds any fresh idea. The ordinances and regulations of the Mysore University are automatically applicable to the new University but not its statutes.

So far as the statutes are concerned, it is the Government that must frame the statutes. Sir, the question of finance, as I said already, would be there. It is said that several lakhs by way of recurring charges have got to be incurred. It is not known how much the proposed University would receive by way of grants from the U.G.C. or Government of India or the Donors. Even donors who would pay a certain amount would become a member of the Senate for the life time. On what basis they have arrived at this amount is not known. Therefore, I say that it would not be a federal type but it would turn out to be a political type. It is said that it will be housed in the Central College. Sir, is it possible to do this? Where would be the University office and the Senate Hall, etc.? To begin with, would they start the University in a shed? Are they doing this to the detriment of the Central College students? Therefore, I am inclined to submit that when we are not in a position to see that the existing University functions successfully to think of a thing like this is something absurd and this Bill deserves to be withdrawn.

† SRI GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wholeheartedly welcome this Bill. The U.G.C. sent its sub-committee for an investigation of the place where a University of a federal nature should start and it is that sub-committee which visited this part of the country that made recommendation to the U.G.C. that Bangalore has most suited for the starting of a Federal University. I am glad that the Mysore Government took note of the observations of the sub-committee appointed by the U.G.C. and are now trying to implement this idea of starting a University at Bangalore.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Why did they not commit themselves to finance it?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, being a Member of that Committee that went to Delhi and a Member of the Committee that made this report, I think it is my duty to enlighten the House with regard to a certain aspect of the matter. Sir, we must congratulate the Government because within such a short time, after the observation was made by the U.G.C., they got the report and prepared a Bill which is now before this august House and if all goes well, by the end of the next month, we can have the pleasure of starting the Bangalore University here.

Sir, my friend Sri Venkate Gowda thought why not the existing Universities of Mysore be converted into a Federal University if the idea is to have a Federal University here. Sir, there are different types of Universities. The Mysore type of University is not of a federal nature. It is a teaching and an affiliating University. The Karnataka University started like that. Both of them are teaching and affiliating Universities. The need for a Federal University was felt because, after seeing the working of the Delhi University, the U.G.C. thought it would be necessary to have a similar University in the South. Sir, the difference between the University as it stands now at Mysore the Karnataka University and the proposed Federal University is this. In the case of the Mysore University or Karnataka University or any other teaching and affiliating type of University, the functions will be different. Each college that is affiliated to the University has absolutely no part in the function and the administration of the University. Only for the purpose of examination, the University has got control over the particular affiliated college. *Vice versa* the affiliated college has no control over the administrative University. While in the federal type, each constituent college a part of the University. As the Minister was pleased to say, the working will be on a co-operative basis or a collective basis because the Professor of the University can go to a constituent college and teach. If there is an eminent Reader in a constituent college in a particular subject, he will have the opportunity to go and teach in another University. So, it is a co-operative institution where all these constituent colleges of the University could work. When we visited Delhi, we saw the functioning of several Universities and we also saw how the standards and efficiency in teaching were maintained. That facility is not there in the present affiliating type of University.

In fact, the University Professors cannot go and teach in an affiliate college here. Suppose there is the best Professor in an affiliate college. He cannot go and teach in the University College. The idea of a Federal University and the very nature of it is this; If my Hon'ble friend goes through the provisions of the Bill, he will see all this in the Bill also. Even so in case of appointment of teachers. In this case, they are called not affiliated Colleges, but the status of an individual College is certainly better and such a type of co-operative working to the benefit of everyone concerned in the area within its jurisdiction is a peculiarity of a Federal University proposed when establishment here both in the appointment of teachers and teaching, they can maintain standards. In the matter of teaching, Professors of Colleges join and work together. So

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

this is a family of Colleges with proper understanding, proper control and management of the University. I can say, if a Federal University of this nature comes into being next year in Bangalore, an entirely different atmosphere will be created in the educational institutions. In Bangalore To-day, the Mount Carmel College may be entirely different; we have nothing to do with it. The National College is one of the best Colleges in Bangalore. We have no benefit of teaching of some of the lecturers of that Colleges. As far as the structure of this University is concerned, the benefit is more and it is for the common advantage of the students.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The benefit will be to the students of those Colleges which come under this, not all;

SRI GANJI VEERAPPA.—That is why the Committee set up by the University Grants Commission thought that a Federal University was really better and that it had got better advantages over other Universities. I can assure the House that when we studied it working in Delhi, we found that the results were better, the standards were better. On the whole, the educational standards in the Delhi University were found to be good. So, the Committee thought that this type of Federal University would be better—thanks to the U. G. C.

I was explaining to the House the advantages of having a Federal University. Luckily in Bangalore there are a good number of industries and the defence industries are there.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I want to know whether the sub-committee's recommendation was accepted by the U. G. C.

SRI GANJI VEERAPPA.—I will come to that. I was explaining that the advantages that were prevailing in Bangalore were many. In Bangalore there are defence industries like the Bharat Electronics, the Hindustan Aircraft, Ltd., the Hindustan Machine Tools, Ltd., and there are very good laboratories in these concerns. There is the Indian Institute of Science that gives specialised training. On account of the existence of the defence industries and the Indian Institute of Science here, it was thought that Bangalore University certainly would be the best place. They might be exploited to the best advantage because a lot of research work had to be made. We are not satisfied with the standards that are prevailing now. It is very difficult to find candidates with suitable qualifications. That is why Bangalore will be affording the best opportunity for specialised subjects and scientific subjects. The representatives of the Indian Institute of Science were also in the Committee. Tomorrow, if luckily, the Centre takes it over, things will be better. The Bangalore University will have the advantage of a very best University with all scientific courses and specialised courses. Sri Anna Rao wanted to know what the reaction of the Centre was to this report. I may explain to this House that when we visited Delhi, we met the Chairman of the U. G. C. Mr. Kothari, the Secretary of the

U. G. C., Dr. K. L. Srimali, who was the Minister for Education then and Dr. Deshmukh. We saw the members of the Planning Commission and all others concerned with this in the Centre. The reaction in the Centre, I am happy to say, was very good and encouraging. If I am to disclose, only on account of the constitutional difficulties, the Centre cannot start a University here because higher education is a State subject. If there is any doubt working in the minds of any of the Hon'ble Members, I do not hold brief for anybody here, but let me assure them that I have got as much interest if not more as my Hon'ble friends have, because in Delhi most of the members of the Planning Commission and members connected with the Government in the Education Ministry, showed their eagerness to start the University. It was examined at length whether they could themselves start a University. The difficulty was a constitutional one higher education being only a State subject. That is why the understanding is that if one State Government starts the University here, I am sure, with the limited knowledge I have, they will take it over immediately and run the University. To that extent the doubts of Sri G. V. Gowda that the State's resources are not sufficient to allow the running of the University will be cleared I may also inform the House that it is their desire to take over as a Central University, because the U. G. C. itself in the report made a recommendation that Bangalore has ideally situated.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I want to know whether the U. G. C. has communicated to the State Government that the recommendation of the Sub-Committee has been accepted by it.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I make it quite clear that there is no firm commitment anywhere. It is a matter for the Parliament to decide because they will have to pass a Bill.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—But as far as the recommendation is concerned ;

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—This is a question more or less pertaining to the Parliament because they will have to pass a law. The Committee's recommendation that Bangalore should have a Federal University has been accepted by the U. G. C. but not as a Central University.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Anyway this much is certain that on account of some legal difficulties, the Central Government has not thought of starting a Central University here. Then with regard to this University being taken over by the Centre there is no doubt because they have unequivocally expressed it and they showed their eagerness about the starting of the University and taking it over. Even if they do not take it over, let us run it ourselves. When all the Colleges situate in Bangalore come under a federal structure. It is for the benefit of every one. Why not we welcome the setting up of a separate University here ?

3-30 P.M.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Some of them do not seem to know that Bangalore is almost a University because it has everything that is found

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

here—Humanities, Science, Law, Engineering, Medicine and so on. In all respects it is a University by itself. The only thing is that it has to become a *fait accompli*.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—That type of University should confine its attention more to the research work and post-graduate study rather than under graduate teaching which is being done by the University of Mysore. If attention is diverted to under graduate teaching and under graduate examinations, then equal attention cannot be given to post-graduate studies and research work. What is envisaged under the Bangalore University Bill is that this University will confine itself to the encouragement of the post-graduate studies and also the research side of it, which is absolutely necessary to maintain the standards and fulfil the objects of a University. That is the background and that is the way we have to approach this question, namely, the starting of the Bangalore University. Should we not have proper development of research work here? Is not Bangalore ideally situated? There is need for a Federal University wherein all our resources, are the resources of the Colleges that come under the University of Bangalore have to be posted together and they must be utilised for the common good of all and though we have all the best Colleges in the City, we cannot make use of the affiliated College, of any other institution, however best it may be. A common pool of all the Colleges would be for the common benefit. That benefit cannot be had under the present system from the present Mysore University. The present Mysore University is already over-burdened with a number of Colleges. Looking at it from any angle. I feel that there is a very great need for a Federal University at Bangalore and we must wholeheartedly welcome this Bill.

With regard to the provisions of the Bill, certain changes, here and there of a very minor nature can be made. A lot of discussion took place with regard to the provision contained in the Bill relating to the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor. That is contained in clause 11. With regard to the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, Sri Sivappa, the Leader of the Opposition, made a suggestion that this has not a proper thing to do and as it prevails in the Karnatak University, he suggests that the Syndicate may send up a panel of three names which the Senate may consider and by a process of election out of the three names they may vote for one of them. It is so in the Karnatak University and I cannot say that it has not worked well, because we have been seeing that it is working very well. It may be due to various reasons. We cannot get the same type of Vice-Chancellor perhaps always. It may be personality or individuality that may count, rather than the system. But this point was elaborately considered by the Committee which went to Delhi. They had a two-hour talk with Sri Deshmukh, an eminent educationist and with other educationists in the country the Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University and others. Much can be said on both sides. It can be said that a man like Dr. Lakshmanaswami

Mudaliar has been continuously there without any trouble. Dr. Pavate has been there. Those are very eminent persons whose personality can overcome other difficulties.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not like names of the outsiders being mentioned here. I know the Honourable Member is paying tributes to them, but ultimately when some other remarks come in, it would be a bit embarrassing.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—There may be even a direct election from the Senate. We cannot say that it is bad. As some of the eminent educationists have told us, there would be a lot of politics if elections are to be held in a direct manner. It may lead to creation of certain groups and parties. The suggestion contained in the Bill, I think seems to be meeting half way. It is neither a direct election from the senate, nor nomination. Of course, the system of nomination should be stopped. None of us can agree that the Vice-Chancellor should be a person nominated. To find a *via media* between these two, to avoid direct election and nomination, the Committee made a recommendation similar to the one prevailing in the Delhi University. If a committee consisting of three persons—two nominated by the Syndicate who have nothing to do with the University, who are not employees under the University and one to be nominated by the Chancellor—if this Committee of three people suggests three names and sends up the recommendation to the Chancellor, then there is a safeguard. If the suggestion is made in a hasty manner by the Committee of three persons, the Chancellor can send it back for re-consideration. There is a safeguard to avoid any hasty, arbitrary recommendation being made.

The committee can reconsider the matter. This system has worked very well in the Delhi University and Government have advisedly accepted the recommendation of the sub-committee.

The provisions contained in clause 11 should be accepted as a *via media* between the nomination and direct election of the Vice-Chancellor.

Sri Sivappa wanted that the Chancellor should also be elected. It cannot be accepted. The convention in many Universities is to have the Governor of the State as the Chancellor. He will be a connecting link between the Government and the University. Very rarely it happens that the Governor is not the Chancellor. The provision in the clause is healthy.

The powers given to the Vice-Chancellor in the first instance are really enormous. He enjoys the powers of the syndicate. He can be a dictator. These powers would be exercised by him for 6 months, but it should not exceed one year. The appointments he makes would last three years. Of course, it might take some time to constitute the various bodies of the University and in the meanwhile somebody has to function. It is also provided that the Vice-Chancellor has to consult the Chancellor. I think this is inevitable and we need not be unduly afraid of the wide powers given to the Vice-Chancellor during the initial period of six months.

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

In the list of the officers of the University, I feel that the Controller of Examinations should find a place. In clause 10, the Chancellor should preside over the meeting of the senate and the convocation. The practice in all universities is for the Vice-Chancellor to preside over the senate and for the Chancellor to preside over the convocation. There is no convention by which the chancellor can preside over the senate. This clause therefore needs amendment.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—In the Karnatak University, it is the Chancellor who presides. Of course in his absence, the Vice-Chancellor presides. In the Delhi University also it is the Chancellor who presides.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—But the Chancellor there is elected.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—True but the President of India is the Visitor and there is no question of a visitor in this Bill. After all, no Governor would try to preside unless the matter is so important. It is the Vice-Chancellor who always presides.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—In a routine business meeting of the senate, why should the Chancellor be associated? The executive head of the University should preside.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—In the absence of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor presides. The Chancellor will not come everytime. The Chancellor, by virtue of his office, should have some powers, not that he is going to preside over the senate. He presides over the convocation.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—In the Delhi University, the Chancellor is elected. Here the Chancellor is the Governor. The Visitor is the Government here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Chancellor is not going to preside, why mention it here?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Tomorrow, if the Bangalore University is taken over by the Centre, the President will become the visitor even in respect of the Bangalore University.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—If it becomes a central university, the President will be the visitor and somebody else will be the Chancellor and he will preside.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know how they can amend the Act unless the matter becomes a concurrent subject. So long as education is a State subject, no amendment can pass through unless it comes before this House. Anyway, Sir, the provision contained here may require some modification because it is the Vice-Chancellor who is to preside over the deliberations of the Senate and not the Chancellor.

With regard to the appointment of the Bursar, the Bursar is the Financial Advisor to the University. The Chancellor may appoint him and not the Government. Then, clause 15 says: "Every Head of a Department of Studies who is a Professor shall, by rotation according to seniority, for a period of one year, act as the Dean of the Faculty."

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the provision contemplates is, when there is more than one Professor, it means, from among the Professors, the senior most person will be the Dean.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, there will be a number of constituent colleges in a particular area. In every college coming within the jurisdiction of the Bangalore University, there may be 20 to 22 subjects. It means, there may be more than one Head of the Departments. In the case of Syndicate the period for the Dean is two years. So, this period one year must be converted into two years.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose there are four constituent colleges out of which three have got Professors and one has got no Professor for the obvious reason, may be due to death or resignation or may be it has not been possible for it to find one. One is only the Head and not a Professor. How does the Hon'ble Member apply this clause? Who are the persons who stand in rotation?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I was coming to that point Sir. If there are ten Professors in ten colleges, the seniority in a particular college may be different.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—It is not like that Sir. There will not be any chance for every college. It will be for a Faculty. For the whole of Bangalore for History, for instance, there will be one Dean.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—What is contemplated here is every Head of the Department of studies. In a particular college the Head of the Department may be a Lecturer. They may designate a man as Professor with lesser quality. He will be the Professor of a University. And there may be several Professors in different colleges.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, this is all due to some confusion. This Faculty has always a reference to the post-graduate studies and research. It has no reference to the under-graduate studies. So, the Dean of the Faculty does always means that he is a post-graduate teacher may be a Professor or a Reader as the case may be. But then, Sir, the difficulty which seems to be with my friend is that the Dean of the Faculty is by rotation and for a year, but, in the Syndicate it is two years. He means to say that here also it should be two years.

Mr. SPEAKER.—About the Dean, may I take it that the classification is subjectwise, regardless of the number of colleges?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Yes, Sir, it is subjectwise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Supposing History subject is taught in all the four colleges?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—No, Sir. It is not history in the under-graduate course. Research pertains to the post-graduate study. Take, for instance, Physics.

Suppose the post-graduate also is included in St. Joseph College, the National College and the Vijaya College and like that. The University will say that Physics has been introduced in these colleges and the student may join any college. It is a Department of Physics in the Faculty of Science.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who has to become the Dean?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Dean will be in the Faculty of Physics in the University and not in the constituent colleges. In this Faculty of Science there are about seven departments. Out of these seven departments, one would be promoted as Dean and it would be on the basis of seniority.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We are yet in confusion.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Here it is clear. In a Faculty there will be so many departments. For instance in the Faculty of Science there are seven departments, *viz.*, Physics, Chemistry, Zoology, Geology, Botany, Nursing and Home Science. These 7 departments will have, each one of them, a head of the Department. Out of these, one of them becomes a Dean. Every head of a Department of studies, who is a professor shall by rotation according to seniority for a period of one year act as Dean. The senior most man will become the Dean for one year in the University. In the Constituent Colleges even though there are post-graduate classes, it is entirely the concern of the University.

4-00 P.M.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—No professor of a Constituent College can become a Dean.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Take for instance the department of physics. Suppose professor of physics of the National College in the post-graduate study is senior and the others are not senior. If he is a senior professor and a recognised professor of the University, naturally he gets the chance.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The reason for my raising the point is...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The confusion arises when the terms are adopted that in a Faculty there is a department of physics, chemistry, and so on. Now, in those departments put together, there is going to be rotation; there is not going to be a rotation among the professors of a Department. Clause 15 (1) says :

“ Every Head of a Department of Studies who is a Professor shall, by rotation according to seniority for a period of one year, act as the Dean of the Faculty : ”

A Faculty is broken up into ten Departments and each department becomes a unit. Therefore, it goes to the Physics Department one year, next year it goes to the Chemistry Department, third year it goes to some other department and so on. I was under the impression that it was a rotation among the professors in a Department. Therefore, there is no difficulty. The Senior most person in the department is the head. If the Hon'ble Members reads clause 2 and Clause 15 together, it becomes clear.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The clarification is right. In a particular Faculty of Science, Commerce or Arts, there will be several departments and there are several departmental heads. What I am anxious to know is.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the rotation is specified he who is seniormost, becomes the Dean.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The teachers of the Constituent Colleges must be recognised whether they teach under-graduate or post-graduate courses. I hope, I am clear about it. When a subject is being introduced as a post-graduate study, that teacher is not part and parcel of the Constituent College, but of the University. So it is the question of Faculty. This confusion arises on account of the fact that we have got affiliated colleges. In a Constituent College you can enrol post-graduate students if you are allowed by the University, but as soon as students as well as teachers belong to the University.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly refer to clause 24 (1) which says :

“ The University shall have the Faculties of Arts, Commerce, Education, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Science and Technology.....”

Therefore, the rotation must be between the Departments of Science.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I want to know whether a professor who is the Head of a College in a Constituent College can come in.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even if he is to come in there is no difficulty at all. There may be competing claims, but when they are resolved, there can be one man. The rotation is with regard to the Department and if there are more than one, it does not vitiate the wording.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Suppose the professor of physics is the Dean, and he has got to issue the lectures list to the Chemistry and Biology departments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is because the subject head is one.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—How can a professor of Chemistry issue the lecture list for Physics?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The bill provides for one Dean for a Faculty. Faculty is broken up into ten departments. If the hon'ble member says that a Physics man cannot do it, then a Chemistry man too cannot do it for Physics. At that level, if the subject head is one of Science, there is something general and he will give guidance. This is only for administrative purposes. He is not going to be the original founder.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The departmental head in an integrated College cannot be equated. He cannot have equal chance to become a Dean by rotation. That is why here if it is left as it is, it only means the Head of the Department of studies, who is a professor; it may bring in even professors in the Constituent Colleges which are teaching under-graduate courses on a par with the post graduate professors.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not said, “Head of Department,” in a College.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—He is one of the authors of the Bangalore University Committee Report. There is no question of any under-graduate teacher being the Dean of a Faculty. It is only possible in the case of post-graduate studies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the matters are crystal clear.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—There is no confusion or difference of opinion. A little clarification is necessary. That is all what I wanted.

With regard to the constitution of the Senate, it is observed that it is too unwieldy. I also feel that Principals of the Constituent Colleges—that clause may also be omitted here, because they come in other capacities.

* With regard to the elected members, instead of saying only 4 members from the Assembly, we can have a slightly bigger number.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—If the Principals are omitted, we can as well give up the idea of a bigger University. The idea is that every Principal should have a say in the University. I have just now looked into the composition of the Senate in Delhi. They have gone to the extent of giving representation to the Professors and Readers.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—It is better the number of representatives from this House and from the Upper House may be increased from 4 to 6. No representation is given to the Academic Council. A representative of Academic Council should be there on the Senate. That is one lacuna which we find here.

With regard to Appointments, there is provision to make appointments to the University and also to make appointments both to the cadres of Professors and Readers as well as Lecturers. There is provision made here for recognising the teachers in a Constituent College as Lecturers or Readers or Professors. That is sub-clause (4) of clause 27. But I suggest that even in the matter of appointment to the Constituent Colleges, the University will have a predominant voice because if the University has a predominant voice in the matter of appointments even to the Constituent Colleges, standards will be maintained and there will be better persons there. Instead of the Chairman of the Governing Body, it is better the Vice-Chancellor is made the Chairman of the Board to select teachers or readers or Professors even for the Constituent Colleges. Government may consider whether a change can be made with regard to that.

With regard to admission as Constituent Colleges, Clause 49 says.

“Colleges within the University Area may be admitted to such privileges of the University as Constituent Colleges as the Chancellor may decide on satisfying the conditions specified in this section.”

Here the Chancellor comes into the picture because he must think which of the Colleges coming under the jurisdiction can be taken as Constituent Colleges and what are the conditions to be fulfilled so as to enable a particular College to become a Constituent College. Of course, provision may be made in the Statutes, Ordinances and other things.

Then the first Vice-Chancellor has to act on the advice of an advisory committee consisting of not more than 15 members nominated

by Government. So far as this is concerned, I think it is only a temporary period for which it functions; perhaps six months and not more than one year. Anyway, instead of saying 'not exceeding one year,' it is better we can confine it to as small a period as possible. Let us say 'six months' so that the newly appointed Vice-Chancellor does not continue because wide powers are given to him. In clause 64, it is said:

"It shall be the duty of the first Vice-Chancellor...(b) to make arrangements for constituting the Senate, the Academic Council and other Authorities of the University, within six months after the date of his appointment or such longer period not exceeding one year..."

Government must see that within six months everything is complete and that the powers do not extend beyond six months because very wide powers are vested in him. I think the period should be restricted to six months.

With regard to clause 67, I wish to make one observation that in the matter of transfer of the Engineering College to the University, here in Bangalore there is one University College of Engineering which belongs to the Mysore University. Automatically it becomes one of the Constituent Colleges under the Bangalore University. Here what is contemplated in item (ii) of sub-clause (2) is:

"The service of every teacher or other employee of the University of Mysore or of the Government employed wholly or mainly in connection with the said college shall be temporarily lent to the University for a period not exceeding one year under the same terms and conditions of service..."

There are certain teachers who are now working in the University College of Engineering in Bangalore. That automatically becomes a part of the Bangalore University, but with regard to the teachers working there, what is provided is that they will be here as lent people for a period of six months.

What should become of those people after six months? Would they revert to the Mysore University or would they be continued by the new University? There must be a safeguard with regard to the personnel working as teachers in the colleges now being taken over.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The matter is clear in the Act itself. Nobody can be transferred against his will. When the Engineering College comes into the Bangalore University, the teachers would work there for six months. Then there would be an Allocation Committee. Those who are not allocated to the Bangalore University would go back to the Mysore University. The Committee will have to go through the entire staff pattern. All the present staff in the Engineering College are not B.Es. Some of them are mere graduates like B.Sc.; and they cannot be easily absorbed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is nothing wrong in principle. Only those who are qualified would be taken and others would go back.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The entire staff of the engineering college would remain where they are for a period of six months. Only the control of the college would go to the Bangalore University.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Equity demands that the college should be taken over along with the staff.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not the only kind of equity. If the University is constituted and is taken over by the Centre, the intake for engineering in the Mysore University is diminished. Since we are taking away a college from them, why not give them another college?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Chair knows how the Regional College of Engineering at Suratkal works. That will not happen.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The matter is not so simple as it looks. Let the teachers have a sense of security that they would continue in the new University.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—A similar provision is contained in the Mysore University Act also and on that basis we have allocated the staff between the Government and the Mysore University, when we took over some of the University colleges. This provision has been copied from the Mysore Act.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The Minister knows that the allocation of staff between the Mysore University and the Government is not satisfactorily settled even now.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—No, it has been satisfactorily solved. But the trouble arises because some people want to remain in Bangalore and do not want to go away. Under this Bill, it is possible that they might not be allocated to remain in Bangalore. Government cannot hand over the entire Central College staff to the Bangalore University. In that case, the other Government colleges would suffer if the best staff goes away to the new University. We want to give them to other places.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—In the case of the engineering college, no question of allocation arises because there is only one Engineering College under the control of the Mysore University.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—According to the Bill, the two Vice Chancellors will sit and decide about the staff in respect of University colleges. In the case of Government colleges, the two Vice-Chancellors and the representatives of Government would also sit together.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I feel that in this matter of transfer of staff, some difficulty would arise for the existing staff.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All difficulties would be covered by the clause entitled 'Removal of Difficulties' (laughter).

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, on the whole, I submit that the Bangalore University is a necessity. The sooner we pass this Bill, the better so that the new University may be Established as early as possible.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Mr. Speaker Sir, I welcome this measure and lend my full support to it, even though I disagree with some of the provisions of the Bill. Sir, with the institution of a University of a federal type, it is expected that this

University will promote higher education, research and dissimination of knowledge in the state. Sir, there are two important features of this University. First, it is a federal University and Secondly, this University will be a national university. Sir, a federal University has got certain definite advantages. There will be uniformity of education, there will be no divergence in standard of education as at present. Secondly there will be corporate system which cannot be found in an affiliating University. The Federal University possesses a corporate life. Thirdly, the federal University can devote attention to the research work, particularly, original research work. Similarly, a federal University can devote more attention to a variety of subjects and it is a matter of satisfaction that this Bangalore University will devote more attention to a variety of subjects and a number of new subjects would be introduced as mentioned in the report of the Bangalore University Committee.

But, as has been pointed out by the Leader of Opposition, there are certain defects in the present system of the colleges at Bangalore. There is no adequate and efficient staff, laboratories are not well equipped and the libraries are also not well equipped. After the institution of this University, all these defects will have to be made up.

Sir, this Bill is based on the recommendations of the Bangalore University Committee and while framing the Bill the model of the Delhi University is kept in view with slight changes here and there. I agree with the Hon'ble Members Sri Venkate Gowda that this report of the Committee should have been discussed in this House, instead of rushing through this Bill directly in this House. Then, this House would have had the opportunity to express its opinion on the different recommendations of the Committee. I, think, sir, that the Hon'ble Minister has done wrong in not giving this House a chance to discuss the Report.

Sir, Universities have to perform a very important task in our national life. In the past the Universities in our country were mere examining machines. In my school days even the Matriculation examination was conducted by the Universities. Conducting examinations was their chief function. But with the advent of freedom, Universities are assuming important functions in the national life. Sir, Dr. Radhakrishnan Committee's Report on University Education has well set out the aims of University Education. According to those aims, the University should be a training ground for intellectual pioneering. Similarly, Sir, the Universities are expected to be sanctuaries of inner life of a nation. Universities should be the home of intellectual adventure. It is expected that this Bangalore University, when instituted, will try to achieve these aims and Government should assist the University for achieving those aims.

Sir, the idea of this Bill seems to be that this University will be converted into a Central University and this is only a stop-gap arrangement till it is handed over to the Centre. But as the Hon'ble Minister has stated there is no definite commitment and it is only a fond hope of the Hon'ble Minister. First, the Central Government must give its

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

consent to make it a Central University and secondly, an enactment in the Parliament will have to be passed. Let us wish that the fond hope of the Hon'ble Minister will be fructified.

About the finances, the Government will provide only 7 lakhs by way of recurring grants. I do not think that this would be adequate. I do not think Government have made provision for the non-recurring expenditure. This 7 lakh will not be of much help for efficient function of the University. Government will have to provide larger funds.

For the successful working of a University efficient and competent teaching is required. The University should turn out men of knowledge, learning and wide perspective and vision. More emphasis should be laid on research work, Particularly quality and quantity of output of research.

Sir, as the Committee's report has observed, the Bangalore University Committee feels that the conduct of research should be made a statutory duty of the Professors and Readers as in Delhi and Oxford if research should get importance. While piloting this Bill, the Hon'ble Minister laid emphasis on this aspect of the University, *i.e.*, the research work. As the Report further remarks, "the professors themselves under the Universities in India would do very well to remember the duties and functions which have been defined by the Professors themselves and the general supervision of research. So, it is expected that the statutes that will be enacted by this University will pay due attention to this aspect of research. It is also a matter of satisfaction that this University will lay more emphasis on scientific and technological knowledge and the Hon'ble Minister has also taken note of it." As has been already pointed out by me, the Committee has recommended that it is necessary to start branches of study like nuclear physics and a number of other subjects I would like to add one more subject to this list and that is 'military science'. There is provision in the Bill for military training, but not military science. Military training is quite different from military science. The Poona University has made a beginning in this subject. It has undertaken to impart training in military science. Particularly in view of the Chinese aggression this has become a very important subject and I would like to suggest that the subject of military science should be included in the list of new subjects.

I would like to make a suggestion regarding the examinations. In Dr. Radhakrishnan Committee's Report as well as the Bangalore University Committee's Report they have made some recommendations. A reform in examination is quite essential and necessary. The present system has become out of date. The examinations should be held in parts. Similarly, class work should be taken into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER.—Are not all these small matters?

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I would like to suggest that this University should introduce the tutorial system as has been followed at Oxford and Cambridge.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—That provision is there.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Hon'ble Minister said that this University would be quite free from Government interference. At present it may seem so, but actually it will not be so, because Government will have its hand by the back-door, if I am allowed to say so. Government will have a hand in a variety of ways, including the constitution of Senate; as has been pointed out by the Hon'ble member Sri G. V. Gowda. There is permission for nominations—three persons will be nominated by the Government and five persons will be nominated by the Chancellor. Similarly I do not understand why a number of Government Secretaries should be there. There is the Secretary of the Government of Mysore, Education Department. It is quite all right. But what is the necessity of including in the Senate the Secretary to the Government of Mysore Finance Department, the Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore and the Director of Medical Services in Mysore? These Government Departments can be consulted by the University from time to time. But what is the necessity of inclusion of these Officers in the University Senate? there by the Government will have an upper-hand in the administration of the University. That is our apprehension. I do not understand the necessity of including the Mayor of the Corporation and the President of the Mysore Chamber of Commerce. All these persons can be consulted from time to time and their services would be made available to the University. Similarly, about the post of Vice-Chancellor, the general opinion seems to be against the election of the Vice-Chancellor, because if a Vice-Chancellor is elected a lot of politics will come in and the Vice-Chancellor will not be a free agent. He will have to always depend on the members and his decisions will not be quite free, because he will take into consideration the votes that he will have to obtain at the time of re-election. The Poona University has tried this method of election. The Vice-Chancellor of the Poona University has been elected. The post of Vice-Chancellor of the Poona University is an Honorary job. It has raised a number of difficulties. The first Vice-Chancellor was the late Barrister Jayakar and the second Vice-Chancellor was wrangler Dr. Paranjpe. They worked as Honorary Vice-Chancellors. But, now the Poona University is finding it difficult to get Vice-Chancellor from outside. The idea is to get the best talent from the country. But, as it is an Honorary and electing job, the Poona University is finding it difficult to get the best talent from outside. So, now there is a proposal.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is the experience about the Karnatak University?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It is a paid job. In Poona, it is not a paid job. Now, there is a move to amend this Poona University Act. So, election, I think, is out of question for proper and efficient administration of the University. But, about his selection as provided in the Bill I do not understand why a Committee of three should be appointed and one member of that Committee should be nominated by the Chancellor. Why the Chancellor should have hand in this? The best way

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

is to follow the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Committee Report. They have said that the Chancellor should appoint the Vice-Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Executive, i.e., the Senate. The Executive should send one name only to the Chancellor. He cannot initiate appointment himself.

This seems to be the best course for selecting the Vice-Chancellor. Because the Vice-Chancellor has to do or is concerned more in his day-to-day work with the executive, that is the Syndicate and it is better for smooth working, his appointment should be recommended by the Syndicate and in case the Chancellor does not approve of it, he may refer it back. So while framing the Bill, the recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Committee Report should have been straightway followed.

As for the tenure of office of the Vice-Chancellor, according to the provisions of the Bill, the Vice-Chancellor is eligible for re-election. The Bangalore University Committee Report has put a limit to his re-election. At the most, the Vice-Chancellor may serve for three terms and not more than that. But here in this Bill, that recommendation is not followed. The Vice-Chancellor may serve any number of years for any number of terms. The Radhakrishnan Committee Report has made this recommendation: "We, therefore, unanimously recommend that all Vice-Chancellors should be appointed for six years and should not be eligible for re-election." This recommendation should have been incorporated in this Bill and that would have been in the best interests of the University. The tenure of office should be six years and the Vice-Chancellor should not be eligible for re-election and the Report has given reason for the recommendation.

One good feature of this measure is about the student welfare. There is a provision for a student welfare board and that is very essential because as education is increasing and poorer sections, students coming from the lower strata are entering in the field of higher education. Formerly, higher education was the monopoly of a few and particularly the rich class, but now with the extension of education, poorer sections and lower sections also are entering in the field of higher education. The welfare of students particularly of the lower income groups and the lower strata will have to be taken care of. There is more need to guard the interests of the students coming from the lower strata. In this respect, I would like to make one suggestion. An Office of the Dean of students as has been in existence in American Universities should be instituted by this University, because this office of Dean of Students will help the students to plan their lives. That is the idea in the American Universities. This office is concerned particularly with the living conditions of the students and also it will render financial and other assistance to the students, particularly the poorer sections by way of making available scholarships and such other facilities. This office of Dean will help the students to guide and

plan their future. So I would like to suggest that this University should institute the office of Dean of Students along with the Student Welfare Board.

As regards the proviso to clause 6, I fully agree with my Hon'ble friend Sri G. V. Gowda that there should be no sort of religious instructions imparted in the University even to those who have consented to receive it. That proviso should be deleted. We are in a secular State and one of the contributions of our great departed leader Shi Jawaharlal Nehru is secularism and if we have to live up to his memory, the imparting of religious instructions should be done away with.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He did not object to religious instructions generally. He had no faith perhaps in any cult. Government should have no religion, not in Education and in a University.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As far as I know his philosophy, I do not think he would have approved of this proviso. With these observations and with the hope that this University would fulfil its functions well and would be a success and would contribute to the progress and advancement of general and University Education in the State, I conclude.

† Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—Mr. Chairman, Sir, when this Bangalore University was envisaged by the Education Minister and in pursuance of a recommendation made by the Sub-Committee of the U.G.C., a committee was constituted by the Government of Mysore, I, thought there was something substantial in it, but I learnt that from that Committee the Vice-Chancellors of Mysore and Karnatak Universities were excluded and I do not know for what purpose they were excluded.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Am I to understand that they were included and then excluded or omitted?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I shall give the explanation. The Vice-Chancellor of the Karnatak University is a Member of the U.G.C. and as such, he could not be taken in. When I could not include the Vice-Chancellor of the Karnatak University, I thought it was not wise for me to include the Vice-Chancellor of the Mysore University, because after the Committee Report, after all this is done, this would have to be considered by the U.G.C. and it would have amounted to a member of the U.G.C. serving on this Committee and taking an independent view of the matter; That was the difficulty.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I do not understand the difficulty. If the Vice-Chancellor of the Karnatak University happened to be a member of U.G.C. he could have helped the Government in the best possible manner; he could have given the advice which the Government wanted. If an invitation had been extended to him and if he had refused to serve on the Committee that would have been a different thing, but he was not invited. I had an occasion to talk with these eminent persons and I learnt that these.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member may please give his ideas:

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—This idea of a Federal University was a failure not only in Delhi but it was also tried in Bombay and there it did not take any shape. If this be the state of affairs, what is the guarantee that this University of a Federal type will serve the best interests of our State? I can understand that since the strength of students is enormous, Government wants another University. That cannot be denied. I saw a statement yesterday of the Hon'ble Minister for Education at the Centre that 25,000 students would be enough for one University. On this score we can concede that an University is required for our State, but not in this pattern. Under the Bill, it is contemplated to bring all the colleges under one pool and make them constituent-colleges. If Bangalore can be a suitable place for establishing a Federal University, why did not the U.G.C. sub-committee make any recommendations for Madras, Bombay and Calcutta?

5-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Should they be made simultaneously? They will come hereafter. They must make a beginning somewhere.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—They have mentioned that of all the places, Bangalore is the best.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—They might have said so. Even Calcutta is full of colleges and the strength of students in Calcutta is more than in any other big place in India. But that idea has not crept in the minds of the U.G.C. committee. I would ask one question—whether the entire U.G.C. considered the matter and took the decision or it was merely the recommendation of the sub-committee of the U.G.C. I know that even the Members of the U.G.C. are not convinced of this. This kind of University has not succeeded anywhere in India. As soon as the U.G.C. sub-committee's report was out, the idea was caught by our Education Minister and immediately he constituted a committee here. Why did he not wait till the entire U.G.C. gave thought to this matter and give the green light to the proposal? Why was he so hasty? Even the Delhi Act is not embodied in this Bill completely. I do not know whether the Delhi Act was passed when the Delhi State was in existence or the sovereign body of Parliament passed the Delhi University Act.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It was passed by Parliament. There was an Act of 1922 which established the Delhi University but Parliament passed another law, took it over and made it a Federal University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Delhi University is a failure, why should it be continued?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—From that point of view, most of our Universities are failures. There would be some trouble or the other. Life is like that.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—We should follow the Delhi pattern throughout but there are departures at every stage. If we want to

establish autonomous Universities, we should provide for democratic methods. I do not see any democracy at all in the Delhi Act even though it might have been adopted by Parliament. The Vice-Chancellor is not an elected person. The Chancellor is the Governor of the State and he can control the whole University. The Bill vests visitorial powers in Government. When these two safeguards are there, why should we fill all these bodies, the syndicate and the academic council, with *ex-officio* Members and nominees of Government? There should be the elected element. We have not come across any University Act having such nominated element.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I will refer the Member to the Karnatak University Act, page “6 Members designated by the Government representing the following departments: a representative of technical education, medical or public health, agriculture, industry, public works and forests”. Not merely that, the Minister for Education, Mysore or an officer of Government nominated in this behalf by the Minister is also a Member.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If the Hon’ble Education Minister feels that the Karnatak University is the most democratic, I must admire him. But in this Bill he has selected some portions from here and some from there.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Chief Justice of Mysore or any Judge nominated by him is also Member. They are all *ex-officio* Members.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, here we are not blindly accepting any report and he cannot thrust any report upon us. He says that the Chancellor will nominate Members to the Academic Council, to the Syndicate and the Senate. In the Karnatak University Act, it is stated that on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, they will be appointed. Has the Government followed this procedure here?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, nomination is there to the Syndicate and the Senate. If the Hon’ble Member wants it to be done on the advice of Vice-Chancellor, I have no objection to add it.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, you know well that the Chancellor is the constitutional Head and can act only on the advice of the State Government. So, if it is the Vice-Chancellor, the Government will not come into the picture. Again, all the *ex-officio* people are Government servants, nominated by Government. Even in a smaller body like a Co-operative Marketing Committee we are doing away with nomination and here, in an autonomous body we are introducing nomination.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, when the Hon’ble Member was himself the Education Minister, all this was there; I have only copied him. (*laughter.*)

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Even if there was a mistake, let him not copy it. Sir, we have got two Acts of our two Universities. Why not follow these Acts and make it a perfect Act following the lines of the Karnatak Act itself?

Then, in clause 19 it is said that Senate is the supreme body. But that supreme body has no voice at all in the selection of the Vice-Chancellor. He happens to be an executive head of the University and the Senate has no say whatsoever in his appointment. I want to ask the Minister whether it is democratic.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the substitute pattern that the member wants?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The same pattern followed by the Karnataka University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Some Members suggested that election was not good.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, in these days, I think election is the only democratic method. If you want to deviate from it, then let us have dictatorial methods.

We can manage it efficiently for a period of three or four years if there are efficient persons. Therefore, I would request the Education Minister to give thought to this question, and not simply adhere to the recommendations of the committee, but we should see the precedent established in our State, the traditions which we are following here and then make such of the modifications which are essential. If you have no confidence in the democratic elections, do away with them. Don't bring in three or four persons from the Senate and others from the Academic Council. I would request him to give second thought to the provisions contained in this Bill and I hope he will do it. He has mentioned that there are 27 Colleges here. In these 27 Colleges, there may be about 20 or 25 thousand students. That is the estimate he has made. Out of these, I think hardly one thousand may be in the post-graduate courses or research. The Central College is there where these post-graduate courses are taught. Post-graduate courses are also being taught in the Engineering College, the Home Science College, in the Central College itself and in the Medical College. In clause 49 it is said that all these Colleges will become Constituent Colleges, but for Constituent Colleges there must be efficient staff and they must meet all the requirements if post-graduate courses or research courses are to be introduced. In all these Colleges these conditions have to be fulfilled.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Research will be done at the University. There is no question of research being handed over to any Constituent College. It is only the question of enrolment in different Colleges, but tuition, practicals and everything will be done in the University. There will be only one Laboratory and the entire body of students in a subject will be taken there and the same sort of tuition will be given and there, will the same sort of practicals for all.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—It means that the present pattern will be followed. In the Mysore University also there are post-graduate courses. If the same pattern is to be followed what is the difference between the two ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Hon'ble Member has not read the report. In affiliating colleges, the post-graduate courses in different subjects are given to different universities. For instance, Mathematics in one University in a College, Chemistry in one University and Physics in another University and so on, and each acts in a different way independently and this has brought in lot of mal-adjustment. The University Campus also does some post-graduate studies. The Central College is carrying on post-graduate studies. All this means that they will be under one unified control, different controls will mean different standards and lowering of educational standards.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—All the constituent Colleges put together make the University. That is the definition given to me. If the Constituent Colleges cannot teach post-graduate courses, they are only under-graduate studies Colleges.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I want to explain it again. All this will be done at the University level. Take the Delhi University pattern. Everything is done for the post-graduate studies in the University. Different Constituent Colleges are enrolling students and sending them to the University for practicals. In the Constituent College they also do some sort of tutorial work and not all things. Some such thing is done and that is allowed, but the entire responsibility for the post-graduate courses and research is that of the University. That is perfectly clear. It is a different type altogether from the affiliating University.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If the tutorial work is done in the College and post-graduate study in the University proper, that is a horrible thing.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Administration lecturing and tuition, all this is done in the University, but only a small part of tutorial work is done in the Tutorial Colleges.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The object of this Bill seems to be to develop and encourage post-graduate courses and research. If this is the object, I think it will not be fulfilled.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member want that object in front of him?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Yes, that object should be fulfilled. If out of these 25,000 students, one thousand or 1,500 who are to be catered by the professors what about other students where this University becomes a teaching University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Other staff is there.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—You may say that you will appoint best teachers, but you cannot say that all those people will be given post-graduate courses. After B.A., or B.Sc., many leave the Colleges.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The logic of the member seems to be that the young boy whose potentialities have yet to be developed, how can he be judged at that age? If there are 25 thousand students, one thousand may become research students.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—In the Constituent Colleges themselves when students finish B.A., or B.Sc., they leave them. He has perhaps not studied the statistics.

5-30 P.M.

If all the Colleges are taken as Constituent Colleges, then who is to equip them. The present Managements will never take interest henceforward. Therefore, Government have to provide every facility for them—equipment, library, anything that is required. What they say is, if they have no equipment and other things, then the Committee will recommend that it will not be recognised. In other Universities if a College does not fulfil any conditions about equipment, buildings and other things it is disaffiliated after giving sufficient notice. If the College is disaffiliated, it will have to dissolve itself because in the jurisdiction of the Bangalore University, it cannot be affiliated to any other University. We know that the Mysore University has got its own Constituent Colleges for which the Mysore University is responsible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The idea of Constituent College of Mysore University is different from the idea of Constituent College mentioned in this Bill. The Constituent College of this University is a part of the University. That is where the idea of federal structure comes in.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—He says there are Constituent College of the Mysore University. Two or three of them are University Colleges they cannot be Constituent Colleges.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—It has to fulfil certain conditions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There must be a provision in this Bill to this effect that all the Colleges which have no buildings, no equipment, no accommodation, will be provided with funds by this University so that they may come up to the expectations of this University. Otherwise, if you do not recognise them as Constituent Colleges, then what will happen to them? They cannot affiliate themselves to any other University.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—As per the provision in clause 49, if they do not fulfil the conditions, they will not be recognised as Constituent Colleges. Government or the University does not take responsibility in this behalf.

Mr. SPEAKER.—While enforcing this measure, they undertake all the liabilities and all the responsibilities and everything to be done, there will be done.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—There is absolutely no worry with regard to any College in Bangalore City. All the Colleges here are well equipped, they are up to the mark and on the Act coming into force, they will be constituent colleges.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—In future we have to extend the buildings, increase the equipments the number of students increases. Nothing can remain stationary. If to-day no funds are required, to-morrow funds will be required. How can we say that no funds are required at all times? If the Management is not able to provide fund, what is the alternative for them? They will not become Constituent Colleges. They will be disaffiliated. This is the fear which I entertain.

As for the teachers of the University, whether they teach in P.U.C. or in the post-graduate courses, they all become University teachers. If you go to mofussil places the colleges situate there are very small not only from the view point of strength of students but also from the view point of number of teachers. But Bangalore is a developing city. Now the number of students may be 25,000, but afterwards it may swell to 50,000.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there any provision in this Bill which says that there should be no College in this area at all, affiliated to any other University?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—That cannot be done.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I give the instance of Delhi. Delhi is now having another University. If Bangalore becomes so big in course of time, we may have two Universities.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If we create another University, it would be a different thing. But the object of encouraging and developing post-graduate studies and research will be frustrated if this body is engaged in examining even under-graduate students. The University must extricate itself from such liabilities, like the Indian Institute of Science. If the need of the day is for research, let there be another University but let us not say here that this University will be exclusively for post-graduate studies or research. The teachers would mostly be occupied with examinations.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the idea of the Member, that this University should only admit students who are already graduates?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Certainly Sir. Even in the case of the Mysore University, the Government disaffiliated some of the University colleges and took them over to relieve the University of some portion of its burden so that it might devote itself more and more to post-graduate studies and research. They do not engage themselves even in teaching work.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Member want the University to do only research?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I have not come across any such University in the world.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The University can examine post-graduate students but they should not take up even lower courses like P.U.C. Research is being done by the Tata Institute. Let us have an institute of that kind here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I believe there are graduation courses also in the Tata Institute. Engineering graduation results are published.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—That is a teaching University whereas this is of a federal type.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—This University will have teaching work upto the level of P.U.C. If that be so, how can we concentrate on technology, science, research in nuclear physics and what not?

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the hypothetical case which the Hon'ble Member has mentioned, how are the students of this area to get education from the lower classes right to the top?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I do not think that difficulty would crop up if they take up post-graduate studies and research only, and leave the rest to the Mysore University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the University is confined to research how can there be co-ordination? Suppose the need is to integrate research with the needs of industries?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The Indian Institute of Science have co-ordination with industries.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am glad that the Hon'ble Member has come to some grip with problems. He started by saying that Bangalore did not deserve an University at all. Now he says that there might be a post-graduate course in such a University. In Bangalore we have the Indian Institute of Science where post-graduate and research is taking place. But we are contemplating a different type of University, wherein the needs of not only post-graduate studies and research, but those of entire field of education, would be satisfied. We are not going to concentrate on under-graduate studies alone but would also concentrate on research and post-graduate courses.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The Tata Insititute is not enough. If we look to the strength of Mysore students, one such Institute would be inadequate. Students with merit all over India are admitted into that college. That is why both Karnatak and Mysore Universities are doing research. What is it that this proposed University would do which the other two Universities are not doing? We must specialise in something which is different from what the other two Universities are not doing.

Then the question of finances would crop up. If the Government provides finances for the constituent colleges, and the standard is thereby raised, what would happen is that all students from the mofussil places would rush to the Bangalore University colleges because the standard of teaching will be high.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Because a large number of students will apply, does that member ask the Government not to start a University?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—No, Sir. Here, the Karnataka University and the Mysore University are already functioning. The Minister expressed a fond hope that the Central Government would take over this University. I say that there is no firm commitment. He himself said that it has a fond hope. I think, it is wishful thinking.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose, it turns out to be a reality?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—It will be good, Sir. But suppose it happens after five years. The money spent for this University will not be worth spending because the other Universities are thirsting for money.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, apart from that, there is this advantage for the proposed Bangalore University. There would be accelerated financial help from the U.G.C. Now, the Central College being a Government College, we are not able to get anything at all. Let my friend go and see what is happening in the Venkateshwara University. They get accelerated help.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, some times if we err, then the whole thing will collapse. If there are more contenders or competitors what will happen? Suppose, Madras will contend; certainly they will carry more. So, we must at least get a firm commitment. If the fond hope of the Hon'ble Minister does not materialise, it would be a great strain on the finances of this State. We are not able to keep up the proper ratio between the students and teachers even at the primary stage. Is it not the first duty of the Government to provide sufficient funds for primary education? When the existing Universities are thirsting for funds, is it wise to start this University?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I want to know whether he supports the Bill or opposes it. *(laughter.)*

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, certain aspects of the Bill have to be brought on a par with the Karnataka University Act; That was my contention in the first instance. Then, with regard to finances, I said, we must get a firm commitment from the Centre.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is only strengthening the hands of the Hon'ble Minister, in which case the idea is very good.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Though there is a hope, if others contend in the field, I do not think Mysore will get any benefit from all these points of view, I request the Education Minister either to defer this or refer it to a Select Committee so that most of the modifications may be made in to make this Bill most democratic and not of an autocratic attitude.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, it is better that we meet at One o'clock instead of at Twelve noon. Some of us find it difficult to have our food by that time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If we meet at One o'clock, we will have to continue till 7 P.M.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—No, no, Sir.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—To meet at Twelve o'clock would be very difficult, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, after this illuminating address by Sri Anna-Rao Ganamukhi, I adjourn the House to meet tomorrow at 12-30 P.M.

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Twelve of the Clock on Wednesday, the 17th June 1964.